arXiv:1109.3863v1 [math.AP] 18 Sep 2011

An observability estimate for parabolic equations from a measurable set in time and its applications

Kim Dang Phung Gengsheng Wang

Abstract

This paper presents a new observability estimate for parabolic equations in $\Omega \times (0,T)$, where Ω is a convex domain. The observation region is restricted over a product set of an open nonempty subset of Ω and a subset of positive measure in $(0,T)$. This estimate is derived with the aid of a quantitative unique continuation at one point in time. Applications to the bang-bang property for norm and time optimal control problems are provided.

Keywords. Parabolic equations, observability estimate, quantitative unique continuation, bang-bang property

1 Introduction and main result

Let Ω be a bounded, convex and open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$, with a boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $T > 0$. We consider the following parabolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + au + b \cdot \nabla u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ u(\cdot,0) \in L^2(\Omega) \ . \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $b \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))^n$, $a \in L^\infty(0,T; L^q(\Omega))$ with $q \geq 2$ for $n = 1$, and $q > n$ for $n \geq 2$. Clearly, it defines a well-posed problem in the sense of Hadamard, that is,

- for any $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, there is a unique solution $u \in C([0,T]; L^2(\Omega))$ of (1.1) with $u(\cdot,0) = u_0$;

K.D. Phung: Mathématiques – Analyse, Probabilités, Modélisation – Orléans (MAPMO), Université d'Orléans & CNRS UMR 6628, Fédération Denis Poisson, Université d'Orléans & CNRS FR 2964, 45067 Orléans Cedex 2, France; e-mail: kim_dang_phung@yahoo.fr

G. Wang: School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China; e-mail: wanggs62@yeah.net

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 93B07; Secondary 35B35

- the solution u depends continuously on the initial value.

The above continuous dependence and the uniqueness can be derived from the following estimate.

$$\int_{\Omega} |u(x,t)|^2 \, dx \leq e^{C_0 t \left(\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))} \right)} \int_{\Omega} |u(x,0)|^2 \, dx \quad \forall t \in [0,T] \ , \tag{1.2}$$

where C_0 is a positive constant depending only on Ω, n and q.

This is a kind of stability estimate which shows how the left term $\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ depends on the right term $\|u(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. From this point of view, the estimate

$$\|u(\cdot,T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{(\Omega,n,q,\omega,E,T,a,b)} \int_{D} |u(x,t)| \, dxdt \tag{1.3}$$

where $D = \omega \times E$ with ω being an open nonempty subset of Ω and E being a subset of $(0,T]$, shows how the left term $\|u(\cdot,T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ depends on the right term $\|u\|_{L^1(D)}$. Here and throughout the paper, $C_{(\ldots)}$ denotes a positive constant that only depends on what are enclosed in the brackets. *An interesting problem is to ask what kind of E makes (1.3) standing.*

When $E = \{T\}$, (or $E = \{t_0\}$, $t_0 \in (0,T]$), (1.3) does not hold. However, it has been obtained (for some potentials a and b) that

$$\|u(\cdot,T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{(\Omega,n,q,\omega,T,a,b)} \|u(\cdot,0)\|^{\alpha}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u(\cdot,T)\|^{1-\alpha}_{L^2(\omega)} \ , \tag{1.4}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$. This is a quantitative unique continuation at one point in time. It is a kind of Hölder continuous dependence in the sense of John. We call (1.4) as the Hölder continuous dependence from one point in time. With regard to the studies of unique continuation, we refer the readers to [BT], [L], [K], [KT] and references therein.

When $E = (0,T)$ (or E is a subinterval of $(0,T)$), the estimate (1.3), viewed as a refined observability estimate in control theory of PDE, has been discussed in many literatures (see for instance [LR], [FI], [DZZ]). It is obtained that the estimate (1.3) holds for a large class of potentials a and b (see [DFGZ]).

The present paper studies the estimate (1.3) when E is a measurable set of $(0,T)$ with a positive measure. The main result is presented as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E \subset (0,T)$ be a measurable set with a positive measure. Let ω be a nonempty open subset of Ω. Then any solution u to (1.1) holds the estimate*

$$\|u(\cdot,T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{(\Omega,n,q,\omega,E,T,a,b)} \int_{\omega\times E} |u(x,t)| \, dxdt \, . \tag{1.5}$$

The key to establish Theorem 1.1 is the following strategy:

Hölder continuous dependence from one point in time

$\Longrightarrow$ Observability from a measurable set in time (i.e.,(1.5)).

This method allows us to build up (1.5) for parabolic equations with space-time dependent potentials a and b. It also provides a different way from that in [W] to get (1.5) for the case where $a = 0$, $b = 0$. The above-mentioned strategy is partially inspired by [M]. In our paper, the estimate (1.4) is built up by the technique provided in [P], [EFV] and [PW].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first shows the Hölder continuous dependence from one point in time, and then presents the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 3 provides some applications of Theorem 1.1 to the bang-bang property for norm and time optimal control problems. In Appendix, the proof of some results (which are used in the proof of Theorem 1.1) is given.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

2.1 Preliminary results

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the following two results. We provide the proof of the first one in Appendix and that of the second one in subsection 2.3.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* $E \subset (0,T)$ *be a measurable set with a positive measure. Let* ℓ *be a density point for* $E \subset (0,T)$*. Then for each* $z > 1$*, there exists a* $\ell_1 \in (\ell, T)$ *such that the sequence* $\{\ell_m\}_{m\geq 1}$*, given by*

$$\ell_{m+1} = \ell + \frac{1}{z^m}\left(\ell_1 - \ell\right) \ , \tag{2.1.1}$$

satisfies

$$\ell_m - \ell_{m+1} \leq 3\left|E \cap \left(\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m\right)\right| \ . \tag{2.1.2}$$

To state the second result, we need the following notation. Let

$$p = \left| \begin{array}{ll} \frac{2n}{q} & \text{if } n < q \leq 2n \\ 1 & \text{if } 2n \leq q \ . \end{array} \right.$$

Write

$$A\left(T, \|a\|\right) = \|a\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + \left(T + T^{2-p}\right)\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))} + T^2\left(\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}},$$

$$K\left(T, \|a\|, \|b\|\right) = 1 + A\left(T, \|a\|\right) + T\,\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}$$

and

$$\beta\left(r, T, \|b\|\right) = \frac{1}{r^2} e^{2T\left(1 + \|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}\right)} \ .$$

Proposition 2.2. *Let B_r be an open ball of radius $r > 0$ and contained in Ω. There is a $C = C_{(\Omega,n,q)}$ such that any solution u to (1.1) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,L\right)\right|^2 dx \;&\leq \left(C \int_{B_r} \left|u\left(x,L\right)\right|^2 dx\right)^{1-\alpha(r,T,\|b\|)} \\ &\quad \times \left(e^{C\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{L}\right)} \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,0\right)\right|^2 dx\right)^{\alpha(r,T,\|b\|)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.1.3}$$

where L is arbitrarily taken from $(0,T]$, and where

$$\alpha\left(r,T,\|b\|\right) = \frac{C\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)}{1+C\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)}\,.$$

Furthermore, there is a positive constant c (only depending on Ω, n and q) such that any solution u to (1.1) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t_2\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;&\leq \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^{\gamma(r,T,\|b\|)}} e^{c\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}\right)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)} \left\|u\left(\cdot,t_2\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)} \\ &\quad +\varepsilon \left\|u\left(\cdot,t_1\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall\varepsilon > 0\end{aligned} \tag{2.1.4}$$

where t_1 and t_2 are arbitrarily taken such that $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$, and where

$$\gamma\left(r,T,\|b\|\right) = C\beta\left(r/2,T,\|b\|\right)\left(1+n/2\right)+n/2\,. \tag{2.1.5}$$

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Write B_r for an open ball of radius $r > 0$ and contained in ω. Let ℓ be a density point for $E \subset (0,T)$. Let $\{\ell_m\}_{m\geq 1}$ be the sequence provided by Proposition 2.1 with $z = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma+2}{\gamma+1}}$, where γ is given by (2.1.5). Let $t \in (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m]$. Then we apply (2.1.4) in Proposition 2.2, where $t_2 = t$ and $t_1 = \ell_{m+2}$, to get that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \;&\leq \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^{\gamma}} e^{c\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{t-\ell_{m+2}}\right)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)} \left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)} \\ &\quad +\varepsilon \left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall\varepsilon > 0\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.1}$$

Since it follows from (1.2) that

$$\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_m\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{C_0 T\left[\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T,L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}\right]} \left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\;,$$

we integrate (2.2.1) over $E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)$ to get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|E \cap \left(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m\right)\right| e^{-C_0 T\left[\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T,L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}\right]} \left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_m\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^{\gamma}} e^{c\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{\ell_{m+1}-\ell_{m+2}}\right)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)} \int_{E\cap(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m)} \left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)} dt \\ &\quad + \left|E \cap \left(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m\right)\right| \varepsilon \left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall\varepsilon > 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

This, along with (2.1.1) and (2.1.2), indicates that there is a positive constant d (only depending on Ω, n and q) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_m\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
\le\ &\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^\gamma}e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\left[\tfrac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\tfrac{z^m}{z-1}\right]e^{d\beta(r,T,\|b\|)\left[\frac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\frac{z^{m+1}}{z-1}\right]}\\
&\times\int_{E\cap(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m)}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt+\varepsilon\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
\le\ &\tfrac{1}{\varepsilon^\gamma}e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}e^{(1+d\beta(r,T,\|b\|))\left[\frac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\frac{z^{m+1}}{z-1}\right]}\int_{E\cap(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m)}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\\
&+\varepsilon\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\quad\forall\varepsilon>0\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^\gamma e^{-\eta z^{m+2}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_m\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}e^{-\eta z^{m+2}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\le e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\int_{E\cap(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m)}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\quad\forall\varepsilon>0\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.2}$$

where $\eta=\left(1+d\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)\right)\left[\frac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\frac{1}{z(z-1)}\right]$. By taking $\varepsilon=e^{-\eta z^{m+2}}$ in (2.2.2), and by using the fact that $\left(\gamma+1\right)z^2=\gamma+2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^m}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_m\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{m+2}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{m+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\le e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\int_{E\cap(\ell_{m+1},\ell_m)}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\ .
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.3}$$

Next, we take $m=2m'$ and then sum (2.2.3) from $m'=1$ to infinity to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{m'=1}^{\infty}\left[e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{2m'}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{2m'}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{2m'+2}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{2m'+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]\\
&\le e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\textstyle\sum_{m'=1}^{\infty}\displaystyle\int_{E\cap\left(\ell_{2m'+1},\ell_{2m'}\right)}\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\\
&\le e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\int_E\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\ .
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.4}$$

Since $e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{2m'+2}}$ tends to zero as $m'\to+\infty$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{m'=1}^{\infty}\left[e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{2m'}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{2m'}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^{2m'+2}}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_{2m'+2}\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&=e^{-\eta(\gamma+2)z^2}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_2\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ .
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.5}$$

Besides, one can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta\left(\gamma+2\right)z^2\ &=\left(1+d\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)\right)\left[\tfrac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\right]\left(\gamma+2\right)\sqrt{\gamma+2}\left(\sqrt{\gamma+2}+\sqrt{\gamma+1}\right)\\
&=C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\tfrac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\left[\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)\right]^3\ .
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.6}$$

Now, it follows from (2.2.4), (2.2.5) and (2.2.6) that

$$\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_2\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le e^{C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\frac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}\left[\beta(r,T,\|b\|)\right]^3}e^{dK(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}\int_E\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\ .$$

This, along with the fact that

$$\left\|u\left(\cdot,T\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\leq e^{C_0T\left[\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T,L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}\right]}\left\|u\left(\cdot,\ell_2\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ ,$$

indicates that

$$\left\|u\left(\cdot,T\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\leq e^{(C_0+d\beta(r,T,\|b\|))K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)}e^{C(\Omega,n,q)\frac{1}{\ell_1-\ell}[\beta(r,T,\|b\|)]^3}\int_E\left\|u\left(\cdot,t\right)\right\|_{L^1(B_r)}dt\ .$$

This leads to the desired results and completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2.3 Proof of Proposition 2.2

We begin with introducing two quantities G_λ and $N_{\lambda,\varphi}$ as follows. Let x_0 be the center of B_r. Let $L\in(0,T]$. For each $\lambda>0$, we define

$$G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)=\frac{1}{\left(L-t+\lambda\right)^{n/2}}e^{-\frac{\left|x-x_0\right|^2}{4(L-t+\lambda)}}\ ,\quad (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\left[0,L\right]\ .$$

It is clear that G_λ is a smooth function and satisfies

$$\left(\partial_t+\Delta\right)G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)=0\ ,\quad (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\left[0,L\right]\ . \tag{2.3.1}$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{array}{rl}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx+\int_\Omega\left|\nabla u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx\\ =&\int_\Omega u\left(x,t\right)\left(\partial_t-\Delta\right)u\left(x,t\right)G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx\ ,\end{array} \tag{2.3.2}$$

for any $t\in(0,L]$. This can be proved by a direct computation. Also it can be derived from the following observation. The quantity

$$\int_\Omega\left(\partial_t-\Delta\right)\left(\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\right)G\left(x,t\right)dx+\int_\Omega\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\left(\partial_t+\Delta\right)G\left(x,t\right)dx$$

where $G\in C^\infty$, has two expressions

$$\int_\Omega\frac{d}{dt}\left(\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2G\left(x,t\right)\right)dx-\int_{\partial\Omega}\left[\partial_\nu\left(\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\right)G\left(x,t\right)-\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\partial_\nu G\left(x,t\right)\right]d\sigma$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rl}&2\int_\Omega\left[u\left(x,t\right)\left(\partial_t-\Delta\right)u\left(x,t\right)-\left|\nabla u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\right]G\left(x,t\right)dx\\ +&\int_\Omega\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2\left(\partial_t+\Delta\right)G\left(x,t\right)dx\ .\end{array}$$

Because of (2.3.1) and since $u=0$ on $\partial\Omega$, (2.3.2) follows from the above two expressions with $G=G_\lambda$.

Next, we define, for each $\lambda > 0$ and each φ such that $\varphi \in C\left([\tau, L]; H^1(\Omega)\right)$ for any $\tau \in (0, L)$,

$$N_{\lambda,\varphi}(t) = \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla \varphi(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx}{\int_\Omega |\varphi(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx}\,,$$

where t is in the set $\{t \in (0, L]\,; \varphi(\cdot, t) \neq 0 \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)\}$.

Proof of (2.1.3) in Proposition 2.2. *The first step to prove (2.1.3) is to estimate* $\frac{d}{dt} N_{\lambda,u}(t)$. *The desired estimate is a consequence of the following lemma.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $(\varphi_0, g) \in L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega \times (0, L))$ *and* $\varphi = \varphi(x,t)$ *be the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi - \Delta \varphi = g & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, L)\ , \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, L)\ , \\ \varphi(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0\,. & \end{cases}$$

Then on the set $\{t \in (0, L]\,; \varphi(\cdot, t) \neq 0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega)\}$, *the function* $t \mapsto N_{\lambda,\varphi}(t)$ *is differentiable. Furthermore, it holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dt} N_{\lambda,\varphi}(t) \leq \frac{1}{L - t + \lambda} N_{\lambda,\varphi}(t) + \frac{\int_\Omega |g(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx}{\int_\Omega |\varphi(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx}\,. \tag{2.3.3}$$

Lemma 2.3 is a direct consequence of estimate (3.26) in [PW]. We omit the proof.

The second step to prove (2.1.3) is to estimate $\lambda N_{\lambda,u}(L)$ *by making use of (2.3.3) and (2.3.2). The desired estimate is stated in the following lemma.*

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a* $C_{(\Omega,n,q)}$ *such that any non-trivial solution* u *to (1.1) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda N_{\lambda,u}(L) + \tfrac{n}{4} \\ &\leq 8\left(\tfrac{\lambda}{L} + n\right) e^{2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} \\ &\quad \times \log\left[e^{\left(1+\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}+C_0\right)\left[A(L,\|a\|)+L\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right]+\frac{m_0}{2L}\right)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^2\,dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 = \sup\limits_{x\in\Omega} |x - x_0|^2$ *and* C_0 *is given in (1.2).*

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Clearly, the solution u to (1.1) holds the property that $u \in L^2\left(\tau, T; H^2 \cap H^1_0(\Omega)\right) \cap C\left([\tau, T]; H^1_0(\Omega)\right)$ and $\partial_t u \in L^2\left(\tau, T; L^2(\Omega)\right)$ for any $\tau \in (0, L)$. One can easily check that $N_{\lambda,u}(t)$ is well-defined for any $t \in (0, L]$. We carry out the rest of the proof by three steps as follows.

Step 1 .- We claim that for any $t \in (0, L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{\lambda}{L+\lambda} e^{-2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} N_{\lambda,u}(L) \\ &\leq N_{\lambda,u}(t) + C_{(\Omega,n,q)} L \left(\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}} + C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \tfrac{1}{L^{p-1}} \|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.4}$$

To this ends, we apply Lemma 2.3 to $(\varphi_0, g) = (u(\cdot,0), -au - b\cdot\nabla u)$ and use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get that

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{d}{dt}N_{\lambda,u}(t) &\leq \tfrac{1}{L-t+\lambda}N_{\lambda,u}(t)\\ &\quad +2\frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |au(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx} + 2\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}N_{\lambda,u}(t)\ .\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.5}$$

Since (A.2.1) in Appendix holds,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega |a(x,t)\,u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\leq N_{\lambda,u}(t)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\quad +C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\left(\left(\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}} + \tfrac{\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}}{(L-t+\lambda)^p}\right)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\ .\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.6}$$

It follows from (2.3.5) and (2.3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{d}{dt}\left[(L-t+\lambda)\,e^{-2t\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}N_{\lambda,u}(t)\right]\\ &\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\left(\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}}(L-t+\lambda)\,e^{-2t\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}\\ &\quad +C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\tfrac{1}{(L-t+\lambda)^{p-1}}e^{-2t\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}\ .\end{aligned}$$

Integrating it over $[t,L]$ with $t\in(0,L)$, after some simple computations, we get (2.3.4).

Step 2 .- We claim that for any $t\in(0,L/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}N_{\lambda,u}(t)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\leq \left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))} + \|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\quad +C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\tfrac{1}{L}\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\ .\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.7}$$

For this purpose, we first observe that (2.3.2) is equivalent to the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx + 2N_{\lambda,u}(t)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &= 2\int_\Omega u(x,t)\,(\partial_t-\Delta)\,u(x,t)\,G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\ ,\end{aligned}$$

for any $t\in(0,L]$. By this and by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx + N_{\lambda,u}(t)\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\leq 2\int_\Omega |a(x,t)|\,|u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\\ &\quad +\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\int_\Omega |u(x,t)|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx\ .\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.8}$$

Because of (A.2.2) in Appendix,

$$\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\int_\Omega a\left(x,t\right)\left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle\le \tfrac{1}{4}\int_\Omega \left|\nabla u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle+C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\left(\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}+\tfrac{1}{L-t+\lambda}\right)\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx\ . \end{array} \tag{2.3.9}$$

We directly get (2.3.7) from (2.3.8) and (2.3.9).

Step 3 .- Conclusion. By (2.3.4) and (2.3.7), we deduce that for any $t\in(0,L/2]$,

$$\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle+\tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{\lambda}{L+\lambda}e^{-2L\left(1+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}N_{\lambda,u}\left(L\right)\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle\le\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\left\|a\right\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle+C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\tfrac{1}{L}\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle+C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\left[L\left(\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}}+\tfrac{1}{L^{p-1}}\left\|a\right\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\right] \\ \displaystyle\times\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx\ . \end{array} \tag{2.3.10}$$

Recall that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tfrac{1}{L}A\left(L,\left\|a\right\|\right) & =\left\|a\right\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}+\tfrac{1}{L}\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))} \\ & \quad +L\left(\left\|a\right\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\right)^{\frac{4}{2-p}}+\tfrac{1}{L^{p-1}}\left\|a\right\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}\ . \end{array}$$

This, together with (2.3.10), gives that

$$\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle+\tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{\lambda}{L+\lambda}e^{-2L\left(1+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}N_{\lambda,u}\left(L\right)\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx \\ \displaystyle\le\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\tfrac{1}{L}A\left(L,\left\|a\right\|\right)+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx\ . \end{array}$$

From this, we deduce that for any $t\in(0,L/2]$,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,t\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,t\right)dx & \displaystyle\le\exp\left(-t\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{\lambda}{L+\lambda}e^{-2L\left(1+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)}N_\lambda\left(u,L\right)\right]\right) \\ & \displaystyle\times\exp\left(t\left[C_{(\Omega,n,q)}\tfrac{1}{L}A\left(L,\left\|a\right\|\right)+\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right]\right) \\ & \displaystyle\times\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x,0\right)\right|^2 G_\lambda\left(x,0\right)dx\ . \end{array}$$

Taking $t = L/2$ in the above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tfrac{1}{(L/2+\lambda)^{n/2}} \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L/2\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4(L/2+\lambda)}} dx \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\left[\tfrac{\lambda L}{4(L+\lambda)} e^{-2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} N_\lambda\left(u, L\right)\right]\right) \\
&\times\exp\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)} A\left(L, \|a\|\right) + L\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right) \\
&\times\tfrac{1}{(L+\lambda)^{n/2}} \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, 0\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4(L+\lambda)}} dx \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.11}$$

On the other hand, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 dx \\
&\leq e^{C_0 L\left(\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L/2\right)\right|^2 dx \\
&\leq e^{C_0 L\left(\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} e^{\frac{m_0}{2L}} \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L/2\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4(L/2+\lambda)}} dx \ .
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (2.3.11), yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 dx \quad &\leq \exp\left(-\left[\tfrac{\lambda L}{4(L+\lambda)} e^{-2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} N_\lambda\left(u, L\right)\right]\right) \\
&\times\exp\left(\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)} + C_0\right)\left[A\left(L, \|a\|\right) + L\left\|b\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right] + \tfrac{m_o}{2L}\right) \\
&\times \int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, 0\right)\right|^2 dx \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda N_{\lambda,u}\left(L\right) \quad &\leq 4\left(\tfrac{\lambda}{L} + 1\right) e^{2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} \\
&\times\log\left[e^{\left(\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}+C_0\right)\left[A(L,\|a\|)+L\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right]+\frac{m_0}{2L}\right)} \frac{\displaystyle\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, 0\right)\right|^2 dx}{\displaystyle\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 dx}\right] \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.12}$$

Clearly, it holds that

$$\frac{n}{4} \leq \frac{n}{4}\log\left[e^{\left(1+\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}+C_0\right)\left[A(L,\|a\|)+L\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right]+\frac{m}{2L}\right)} \frac{\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, 0\right)\right|^2 dx}{\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 dx}\right] \ . \tag{2.3.13}$$

Now, the desired estimate in Lemma 2.4 follows immediately from (2.3.12) and (2.3.13). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4.

The third step to prove (2.1.3) is to get an estimate of $\int_\Omega \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx$ *in term of* $\int_{B_r} \left|u\left(x, L\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx$*. It is a consequence of the following lemma.*

Lemma 2.5. *For any non-trivial* $f \in H^1\left(\Omega\right)$ *and any* $\lambda > 0$*, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \left|f\left(x\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \quad &\leq \int_{B_r} \left|f\left(x\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \\
&\quad + \tfrac{16\lambda}{r^2}\left(\lambda N_{\lambda,f}\left(L\right) + \tfrac{n}{4}\right) \int_\Omega \left|f\left(x\right)\right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.5. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ \leq&\int_{B_r}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx+\int_{\Omega\cap\{|x-x_o|\geq r\}}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ \leq&\int_{B_r}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx+\frac{16\lambda}{r^2}\int_{\Omega}\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{16\lambda}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.14}$$

Next, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega}\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{16\lambda}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ \leq&\,\lambda\int_{\Omega}|\nabla f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx+\frac{n}{4}\int_{\Omega}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.15}$$

When this is done, the desired estimate in Lemma 2.5 follows at once from (2.3.14) and (2.3.15). It remains to show (2.3.15). This can be done by what follows (see also [EFV, page 211]).

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega}|x-x_0|^2|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ =&\int_{\Omega}(x-x_0)|f(x)|^2\cdot(-2\lambda)\nabla e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ =&-2\lambda\int_{\partial\Omega}((x-x_0)\cdot\nu)|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}d\sigma+2\lambda n\int_{\Omega}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ &+4\lambda\int_{\Omega}(x-x_0)f(x)\cdot\nabla f(x)e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ \leq&\,2\lambda n\int_{\Omega}|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\\ &+\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega}16\lambda^2|\nabla f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega}|x-x_0|^2|f(x)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}dx\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.3.16}$$

In (2.3.16), it is used in the first equality that $(-2\lambda)\nabla e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}=(x-x_0)e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}$; integration by parts is applied in the second equality; Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, along with the assumption that Ω is convex, is applied in the last inequality. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.5.

The last step to prove (2.1.3) of Proposition 2.2 is to drop the weight function $e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}}$ *in the integrands.*

Recall that for any $\tau\in(0,L)$, $u\in L^2(\tau,T;H^2\cap H_0^1(\Omega))\cap C([\tau,T];H_0^1(\Omega))$ and $\partial_t u\in L^2(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Without a loss of generality, we assume that u is non-trivial in order that $N_{\lambda,u}(t)$ is well-defined for any $t\in(0,L]$. We apply Lemma 2.5 where

$f = u(\cdot, L)$ to get that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx &\leq \int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \\ &\quad + \tfrac{16\lambda}{r^2} \left(\lambda N_{\lambda,u}(L) + \tfrac{n}{4}\right) \int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \, .\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.17}$$

By Lemma 2.4, it holds that

$$\lambda N_{\lambda,u}(L) + \frac{n}{4} \leq \frac{1}{16}\left(\frac{\lambda}{L} + n\right) Z_u \, , \tag{2.3.18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_u &= 16 \times 8 e^{2L\left(1+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right)} \\ &\quad \times \log\left[e^{\left(1+\left(C_{(\Omega,n,q)}+C_0\right)\left[A(L,\|a\|)+L\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,L))}\right]+\frac{m_0}{2L}\right)} \frac{\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^2 dx}{\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 dx}\right] \, . \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.19}$$

Combining (2.3.17) and (2.3.18), we get that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_o|^2}{4\lambda}} dx &\leq \int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \\ &\quad + \tfrac{\lambda}{r^2}\left(\tfrac{\lambda}{L} + n\right) Z_u \int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 e^{-\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{4\lambda}} dx \, .\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.20}$$

We take

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\left(-nL + \sqrt{n^2L^2 + \frac{2Lr^2}{Z_u}}\right) \, .$$

Clearly it solves

$$\frac{\lambda}{r^2}\left(\frac{\lambda}{L} + n\right) Z_u = \frac{1}{2} \, . \tag{2.3.21}$$

Then it follows from (2.3.20) and (2.3.21) that

$$\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2 dx \leq 2 e^{\frac{m_0}{4\lambda}} \int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2 dx \, , \tag{2.3.22}$$

where m_0 is given by Lemma 2.4.

On the other hand, it holds that

$$e^{\frac{m_0}{4\lambda}} \leq e^{\frac{(n+1)m_0}{2}\frac{Z_u}{r^2}} \tag{2.3.23}$$

because

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{2}{-nL+\sqrt{n^2L^2+\frac{2Lr^2}{Z_u}}} &= \tfrac{Z_u}{Lr^2}\left(nL + \sqrt{n^2L^2 + \tfrac{2Lr^2}{Z_u}}\right) \\ &\leq \tfrac{Z_u}{Lr^2}\left(nL + \sqrt{n^2L^2 + \tfrac{4L^2r^2}{m_0}}\right) \\ &\leq \tfrac{Z_u}{r^2}\left(n + \sqrt{n^2+4}\right) \, .\end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality of the above, we used that $Z_u > \frac{m_0}{2L}$. Now it follows from (2.3.22) and (2.3.23) that

$$\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx \le 2e^{\frac{(n+1)m_0}{2}\frac{Z_u}{r^2}} \int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2\,dx\,. \tag{2.3.24}$$

Next, by (2.3.19), there is a $C = C_{(\Omega,n,q)} > 2$ such that

$$\frac{(n+1)\,m_0}{2}\frac{Z_u}{r^2} \le C\beta\left(r,T,\|b\|\right)\log\left[e^{C\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{L}\right)}\frac{\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^2\,dx}{\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx}\right]\,.$$

This, together with (2.3.24), yields that

$$\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx \le 2\left[e^{C\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{L}\right)}\frac{\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^2\,dx}{\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx}\right]^{C\beta(r,T,\|b\|)} \int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2\,dx\,.$$

In summary, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u(x,L)|^2\,dx \quad &\le \left(2\int_{B_r} |u(x,L)|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{1+C\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}} \\ &\quad\times\left(e^{C\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{L}\right)}\int_\Omega |u(x,0)|^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{C\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}{1+C\beta(r,T,\|b\|)}}\end{aligned}$$

which leads to (2.1.3).

Proof of (2.1.4) in Proposition 2.2 . Let $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$. The estimate (2.1.3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad &\le \left(\sqrt{C}\,\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|_{L^2\left(B_{r/2}\right)}\right)^{1-\alpha(r/2,T,\|b\|)} \\ &\quad\times\left(e^{C\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}\right)}\,\|u(\cdot,t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{\alpha(r/2,T,\|b\|)}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.25}$$

On the other hand, by Nash inequality and Poincaré inequality, there exists $c > 0$ (depending only on Ω and n) such that

$$\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|^{1+2/n}_{L^2\left(B_{r/2}\right)} \le \frac{c}{r}\,\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|^{2/n}_{L^1(B_r)}\,\|\nabla u(\cdot,t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,. \tag{2.3.26}$$

It follows from the standard energy method that

$$\|\nabla u(\cdot,t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{1}{(t_2-t_1)^{1/2}}e^{c\left(1+T\left[\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))}+\|b\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))}\right]\right)}\,\|u(\cdot,t_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,, \tag{2.3.27}$$

where $c > 0$ (depends only on Ω, n and q). Combining (2.3.25), (2.3.26) and (2.3.27), we deduce that there is a positive constant d (only depending on Ω, n and q) such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad &\le \left(\tfrac{1}{r}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha(r/2,T,\|b\|)}{1+2/n}}\,e^{d\left(K(T,\|a\|,\|b\|)+\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}\right)} \\ &\quad\times\|u(\cdot,t_2)\|^{\frac{2/n}{1+2/n}[1-\alpha(r/2,T,\|b\|)]}_{L^1(B_r)}\,\|u(\cdot,t_1)\|^{1-\frac{2/n}{1+2/n}[1-\alpha(r/2,T,\|b\|)]}_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

This, together with some simple computations, leads to estimate (2.1.4), and completes the proof of Proposition 2.2.

3 Applications to bang-bang controls

Throughout this section, we assume that $a \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$, $B \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))^n$ with div$B \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))$ and $y^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$; we let ω be a nonempty open subset of Ω; and we denote by $1_{|\cdot}$ the characteristic function of a set in the place where $\cdot$ stays.

Let $\tau \in [0,T)$. Let $E \subset (\tau,T)$ be a measurable set of positive measure. Consider the following parabolic equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t\psi - \Delta\psi + a\psi + B\cdot\nabla\psi = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau,T)}1_{|E}v & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ \psi(\cdot,0) = \psi^0 & \text{in } \Omega\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{3.1}$$

where $v \in L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))$ and $\psi^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then (3.1) admits a unique solution ψ in $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))$. The adjoint equation of (3.1) is as:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} -\partial_t\vartheta - \Delta\vartheta + (a - \text{div}B)\,\vartheta - B\cdot\nabla\vartheta = 0 & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ \vartheta = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ \vartheta(\cdot,T) \in L^2(\Omega)\ . & \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2}$$

By Theorem 1.1, any solution ϑ to (3.2) satisfies

$$\|\vartheta(\cdot,0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \kappa\int_{\omega\times E}|\vartheta(x,t)|\,dxdt\,, \tag{3.3}$$

where the constant κ is independent of ϑ. This is equivalent to the null-controllability from E: for any $\psi^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, there is a $v \in L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))$, with

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))} \leq \kappa\left\|\psi^0\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ , \tag{3.4}$$

such that the corresponding solution ψ to (3.1) satisfies $\psi(\cdot,T) = 0$ in Ω. (See e.g. [W]). In general, such a v is not unique.

3.1 Norm optimal bang-bang control

Consider the following parabolic equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t y - \Delta y + ay + B\cdot\nabla y = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau,T)}f & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T)\ , \\ y(\cdot,0) = y^0 & \text{in } \Omega\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{3.1.1}$$

where $f \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$. Then equation (3.1.1) admits a unique solution y in the class of $C([0,T];L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H_0^1(\Omega))$. Write

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{f \in L^\infty\left(0,T;L^2(\Omega)\right); y(\cdot,T) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\right\}\ ,$$

where y is the solution of (3.1.1) corresponding to f.

Theorem 3.1. *There is a unique* $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ *such that*

$$\|f^*\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \min_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \ . \tag{3.1.2}$$

Furthermore, f^* *holds the bang-bang property:*

$$\|f^*(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|f^*\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \qquad \text{for a.e. } t\in(\tau,T) \ . \tag{3.1.3}$$

Remark 3.2. In the control theory of PDE, the equation (3.1.1) is called a controlled system while f is called a control. $f \in \mathcal{F}$ means that the control f in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ drives the solution y of (3.1.1) from y^0 to zero at time T. The property that $\mathcal{F}$ is nonempty is called the null-controllability for (3.1.1). The quantity

$$\widetilde{M} = \min_{\widetilde{f}\in\mathcal{F}} \left\|\widetilde{f}\right\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \tag{3.1.4}$$

measures the best cost of such controls. The norm optimal control problem (with respect to (3.1.1)) is to ask for a control $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \widetilde{M}$. Such a control is called a norm optimal control. The norm optimal control problem has the bang-bang property if any norm optimal control f holds that $\|f(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \widetilde{M}$ for a.e. $t\in(\tau,T)$. Theorem 3.1 presents that the norm optimal problem has a unique optimal control and holds the bang-bang property.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We carry out the proof by three steps as follows.

Step 1 .- Existence. By the well-known result on the null controllability of parabolic equations (see [DFGZ]), we have that $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$. Then by making use of the standard argument of calculus of variations, we get the existence of such a control $f \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \widetilde{M}$.

Step 2 .- Bang-bang property. We prove that if $f\in\mathcal{F}$ satisfies (3.1.2), then f must hold (3.1.3). By seeking a contradiction, we suppose that (3.1.3) did not hold for some $f\in\mathcal{F}$ satisfying (3.1.2). Then there would be an $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ and a measurable set $E\subset(\tau,T)$, with a positive measure, such that

$$\|f(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \widetilde{M} - \varepsilon \quad \forall t\in E \ . \tag{3.1.5}$$

Here $\widetilde{M}$ is given by (3.1.4). We claim that there are a $f_\delta \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ with

$$\|f_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} \le (1-\delta)\widetilde{M} \quad \text{for some } \delta\in(0,1) \ , \tag{3.1.6}$$

and a function y_δ with the property that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y_\delta - \Delta y_\delta + a y_\delta + B\cdot\nabla y_\delta = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau,T)} f_\delta & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T) \ , \\ y_\delta = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T) \ , \\ y_\delta(\cdot,0) = y^0 & \text{in } \Omega \ , \\ y_\delta(\cdot,T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \ . \end{cases} \tag{3.1.7}$$

The existence of such a triplet $(\delta, f_\delta, y_\delta)$ that satisfies (3.1.6) and (3.1.7) clearly contradicts with the definition of $\widetilde{M}$. Now, we prove the claim. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ (which will be determined later). By Theorem 1.1 and its equivalence to the null-controllability from E, there is a control $v_\delta \in L^\infty(\Omega \times 0, T)$ such that the solution ψ_δ to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t \psi_\delta - \Delta \psi_\delta + a\psi_\delta + B \cdot \nabla \psi_\delta = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau,T)} 1_{|E} v_\delta & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ \psi_\delta = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ \psi_\delta(\cdot, 0) = \delta y^0 & \text{in } \Omega \ , \end{array} \right. \tag{3.1.8}$$

satisfies $\psi_\delta(\cdot, T) = 0$ in Ω. Furthermore, there is a $\kappa > 0$ (independent on δ) such that

$$\|v_\delta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq |\Omega|^{1/2} \|v_\delta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))} \leq \kappa\delta \left\|y^0\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ . \tag{3.1.9}$$

Then we define f_δ by setting

$$f_\delta = (1-\delta) f + 1_{|E} v_\delta \ . \tag{3.1.10}$$

By taking $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa\|y^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\varepsilon}$, one can easily check that

$$\|f_\delta(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq (1-\delta)\widetilde{M} \qquad \text{for a.e. } t \in (\tau, T) \ . \tag{3.1.11}$$

On the other hand, one can verify that the function $(1-\delta)y + \psi_\delta$ satisfies (3.1.7). This, together with (3.1.11), shows the claim.

Step 3 .- Uniqueness. By the bang-bang property and the parallelogram identity, we can easily check that the control $f \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2(\Omega))} = \widetilde{M}$ is unique (see [F, page 45]).

This completes the proof.

3.2 Time optimal bang-bang control

Consider the following parabolic equation:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t y - \Delta y + ay + B \cdot \nabla y = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau,T)} g & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T) \ , \\ y(\cdot, 0) = y^0 & \text{in } \Omega \ , \end{array} \right. \tag{3.2.1}$$

where $g \in L^\infty(0,T; L^2(\Omega))$. Write

$$\mathcal{G}^M = \left\{ g \in L^\infty\left(0,T; L^2(\Omega)\right); \ \|g\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \leq M \right\} \ , \tag{3.2.2}$$

where $M > 0$. We define

$$\mathcal{P}^M = \left\{ (\tau, g) \in [0,T) \times \mathcal{G}^M; y(\cdot, T) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \right\} \ , \tag{3.2.3}$$

where y is the solution of (3.2.1) corresponding to g.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{P}^M \neq \emptyset$. If $(\tau^*, g^*) \in \mathcal{P}^M$ is such that*

$$\tau^* \geq \tau \quad \text{for any pair } (\tau, g) \in \mathcal{P}^M , \tag{3.2.4}$$

then g^* holds the bang-bang property:

$$\|g^*(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = M \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (\tau^*, T) . \tag{3.2.5}$$

Furthermore, there is at most one such pairs (τ^*, g^*).

Remark 3.4. It may happen that $\mathcal{P}^M = \emptyset$. To guarantee that $\mathcal{P}^M \neq \emptyset$ for some $T > 0$, it is necessary to impose certain conditions on potentials a and B. For instance, it can be checked that one of the following two conditions implies that $\mathcal{P}^M \neq \emptyset$:

· $0 \leq a - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{div}B + \lambda_1$ for a.e. $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$;

· $\left\|a - \frac{1}{2}divB\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))} \leq \lambda_1$.

Here $\lambda_1 > 0$ denotes the first Dirichlet eigenvalue.

Remark 3.5. There is a kind of time optimal control problem whose aim is to delay initiation of active control (in a control constraint set) as late as possible, such that the corresponding solution (of a controlled system) reaches a target by a fixed ending time (see e.g. [MS]). In the current study, the controlled system is (3.2.1), where g is viewed as a control; the target is $\{0\} \subset L^2(\Omega)$; the ending time is T; and the control constraint set is given by (3.2.2), where M is regarded as a bound of controls. $(\tau, g) \in \mathcal{P}^M$ means that the control g is not active in $\Omega \times (0, \tau)$ and drives the solution of (3.2.1) from y^0 to zero at time T. The time

$$\tau^* = \max_{(\tau,g)\in\mathcal{P}^M} \tau$$

is called the optimal time; while a control g^*, with $(\tau^*, g^*) \in \mathcal{P}^M$, is called a time optimal control. Now from perspective of control theory of PDE, Theorem 3.3 presents that any time optimal control g^* holds the bang-bang property: $\|g^*(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = M$ for a.e. $t \in (\tau^*, T)$. It also shows that the optimal control, if it exists, is unique.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The uniqueness of the pair (τ^*, g^*) follows directly from the bang-bang property (3.2.5) and the parallelogram identity (see [F, page 45]). Thus, it remains to prove (3.2.5). By contradiction, we suppose that there was a pair $(\tau^*, g^*) \in \mathcal{P}^M$ satisfying (3.2.4) such that (3.2.5) did not hold. Then there would be an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a measurable set $\widetilde{E} \subset (\tau^*, T)$, with a positive measure, such that

$$\|g^*(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M - \varepsilon \quad \forall t \in \widetilde{E} . \tag{3.2.6}$$

We claim that there are a $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and a pair (y, g) with $g \in \mathcal{G}^M$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y - \Delta y + ay + B \cdot \nabla y = 1_{|\omega\times(\tau^*+\delta,T)}\, g & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T) , \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T) , \\ y(\cdot, 0) = y^0 & \text{in } \Omega , \\ y(\cdot, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega . \end{cases} \tag{3.2.7}$$

The existence of such a triplet (δ, y, g) clearly contradicts with (3.2.4). To prove the claim, we first observe that there is a $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that the measurable set

$$E = \widetilde{E} \cap (\tau^* + \delta_0, T)$$

has a positive measure. Then, it follows from (3.2.6) that

$$\|g^*(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M - \varepsilon \quad \forall t \in E\ . \tag{3.2.8}$$

Let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, which will be determined later. By solving the equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t z - \Delta z + az + B \cdot \nabla z = -1_{|\omega \times (\tau^*, \tau^* + \delta)}\, g^* & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, \tau^* + \delta)\ , \\ z = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, \tau^* + \delta)\ , \\ z(\cdot, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega\ , \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2.9}$$

we get that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \|z(\cdot, \tau^* + \delta)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \leq c_0 \|g^*\|_{L^1(\tau^*, \tau^*+\delta; L^2(\Omega))} \\ & \leq c_0 M \delta\ , \end{array} \tag{3.2.10}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is independent on δ.

Next, by Theorem 1.1 and its equivalence to the null-controllability from E, there is a control $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (\tau^* + \delta, T))$ such that the solution ψ to the equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t \psi - \Delta \psi + a\psi + B \cdot \nabla \psi = 1_{|\omega \times (\tau^* + \delta, T)}\, 1_{|E}\, v & \text{in } \Omega \times (\tau^* + \delta, T)\ , \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (\tau^* + \delta, T)\ , \\ \psi(\cdot, \tau^* + \delta) = z(\cdot, \tau^* + \delta) & \text{in } \Omega\ , \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2.11}$$

satisfies $\psi(\cdot, T) = 0$ in Ω. Furthermore, it holds that

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(\tau^*+\delta, T; L^2(\Omega))} \leq |\Omega|^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (\tau^* + \delta, T))} \leq \kappa \|z(\cdot, \tau^* + \delta)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ , \tag{3.2.12}$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ independent on δ. Combining the above estimate with (3.2.10), we can find a constant $c > 0$, independent on δ, such that

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(\tau^*+\delta, T; L^2(\Omega))} \leq c\delta\ . \tag{3.2.13}$$

Now, we define

$$w(\cdot, t) = \left| \begin{array}{ll} z(\cdot, t) & \text{if } t \in [0, \tau^* + \delta]\ , \\ \psi(\cdot, t) & \text{if } t \in (\tau^* + \delta, T]\ . \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2.14}$$

Clearly, $w(\cdot, 0) = 0$ and $w(\cdot, T) = 0$ in Ω. Let y^* be the solution of (3.2.1) with $(\tau, g) = (\tau^*, g^*)$. Thus it holds that $y^*(\cdot, T) = 0$ in Ω. Further, one can easily check that the function $y^* + w$ solves (3.2.7) with

$$g(\cdot, t) = \left| \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } t \in [0, \tau^* + \delta]\ , \\ g^*(\cdot, t) + 1_{|E}\, v(\cdot, t) & \text{if } t \in (\tau^* + \delta, T]\ . \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2.15}$$

Finally, we take $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $c\delta \leq \varepsilon$. Then it holds that $g \in \mathcal{G}^M$. Indeed, it follows from (3.2.15), (3.2.8) and (3.2.13) that

$$\begin{array}{rl} \|g(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \leq \|g^*(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\|1_{|E}v(\cdot,t)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \left| \begin{array}{ll} M - \varepsilon + c\delta & \text{a.e. if } t \in E \cap (\tau^* + \delta, T) \\ M & \text{a.e. if } t \notin E \cap (\tau^* + \delta, T) \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in (0, \tau^* + \delta) \end{array} \right. \\ & \leq M \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0,T) \ . \end{array}$$

This completes the proof.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 2.1

Since $|E| > 0$, almost every point of E is a point of density of $E \subset (0,T)$. Let $\ell \in (0,T)$ be such a point. Then it holds that

$$\frac{|E^c \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|}{|(\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|} \to 0 \text{ and } \frac{|E \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|}{|(\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|} \to 1 \text{ as } \theta \to 0 \ . \tag{A.1.1}$$

Let $z > 1$. Let $0 < \epsilon \leq$min$\left(\frac{z-1}{1+3z}, \frac{1}{3}\right)$ which implies that

$$\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\left(\frac{1+z}{z-1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right) \leq \frac{3}{2} \ . \tag{A.1.2}$$

Then by (A.1.1), there exists $\theta_o = \theta_o(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for any $\theta < \theta_o$,

$$\frac{|E^c \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|}{|(\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|} < \epsilon \text{ and } 1 - \epsilon < \frac{|E \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|}{|(\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)|} \ ,$$

which imply that

$$|E^c \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)| < \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}|E \cap (\ell-\theta,\ell+\theta)| \ . \tag{A.1.3}$$

Write $\widetilde{\theta_o}$ =min$(\theta_o, T-\ell)$. Let ℓ_1 be such that $\ell < \ell_1 < \ell + \widetilde{\theta_o} \leq T$. Define $\{\ell_m\}_{m\geq 1}$ by (2.1.1). Clearly,

$$\ell_m - \ell < \ell_{m-1} - \ell < \cdots < \ell_2 - \ell < \ell_1 - \ell < \widetilde{\theta_o} \leq \theta_o \tag{A.1.4}$$

and

$$\ell_{m+1} - \ell_{m+2} = \frac{1}{z^{m+1}}(z-1)(\ell_1 - \ell) \ . \tag{A.1.5}$$

Then

$$\begin{array}{rl} \ell_m - \ell_{m+1} & = |E^c \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)| + |E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)| \\ & \leq |E^c \cap (2\ell - \ell_m, \ell_m)| + |E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)| \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}|E \cap (2\ell - \ell_m, \ell_m)| + |E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)| \ . \end{array} \tag{A.1.6}$$

The first inequality in (A.1.6) follows from (2.1.1); while in the second inequality of (A.1.6), we used (A.1.3), with $\theta = \ell_m - \ell$, and (A.1.4). Thus we have that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \ell_m - \ell_{m+1} & \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\left[\left|E \cap (2\ell - \ell_m, \ell_{m+1})\right| + \left|E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)\right|\right] + \left|E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)\right| \\ & \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right)\left|E \cap (\ell_{m+1}, \ell_m)\right| + \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\left[\ell_{m+1} - (2\ell - \ell_m)\right] \ . \end{array} \tag{A.1.7}$$

Besides, it follows from (2.1.1) and (A.1.5) that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \ell_{m+1} - (2\ell - \ell_m) & = \frac{1}{z^m}(1+z)(\ell_1 - \ell) \\ & = \frac{1+z}{z-1}(\ell_m - \ell_{m+1}) \ . \end{array}$$

This, along with (A.1.7) and (A.1.2), leads to (2.1.2).

Some inequalities

Suppose $a \in L^\infty(0,T;L^q(\Omega))$ where $q \geq 2$ for $n = 1$, and $q > n$ for $n \geq 2$. Let

$$p = \left| \begin{array}{ll} \frac{2n}{q} & \text{if } n < q \leq 2n \\ 1 & \text{if } 2n \leq q \end{array} \right.$$

Then, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $C_{(\varepsilon,\Omega,n,q)} > 0$ such that for any $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and for a.e. $t \in (0,L) \subset [0,T]$,

$$\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \left|a(x,t)\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \\ \leq \varepsilon \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \\ \quad + C_{(\varepsilon,\Omega,n,q)}\left(\|a\|^{4/(2-p)}_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))} + \frac{\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}}{(L-t+\lambda)^p}\right)\int_\Omega \left|\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \end{array} \tag{A.2.1}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{l} \displaystyle\int_\Omega a(x,t)\left|\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \\ \leq \varepsilon \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \\ \quad + C_{(\varepsilon,\Omega,n,q)}\left(\|a\|^2_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))} + \frac{\|a\|_{L^\infty(0,L;L^q(\Omega))}}{L-t+\lambda}\right)\int_\Omega \left|\phi(x)\right|^2 G_\lambda(x,t)\,dx \ . \end{array} \tag{A.2.2}$$

Proof of (A.2.1) and (A.2.2). Notice that $1 \leq p < 2$. In the case where $n \geq 2$, it holds that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega |a\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \\
&\leq \|a^2\|_{L^{\frac{n}{p}}(\Omega)} \|\phi^2 G_\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{n}{n-p}}(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\leq \|a\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{p}}(\Omega)} \left\| (\phi^2 G_\lambda)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|^p_{L^{\frac{pn}{n-p}}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)} \left\| \nabla \left((\phi^2 G_\lambda)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \right\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Sobolev inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \left(|\phi|^{2-p} |\nabla\phi|^p G_\lambda + |\phi|^2 (G_\lambda)^{1-p} |\nabla G_\lambda|^p \right) dx \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)} \left(\int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right)^{\frac{2-p}{2}} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \text{ (by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\quad + C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)} \left(\tfrac{1}{|L-t+\lambda|^p} \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right) \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)} \left(\varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx + \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2-p}}} + \frac{1}{|L-t+\lambda|^p} \right) \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right) \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega a\, |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \\
&\leq \|a\|_{L^n(\Omega)} \|\phi^2 G_\lambda\|_{L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n)} \|a\|_{L^n(\Omega)} \|\nabla(\phi^2 G_\lambda)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Sobolev inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \left(|\phi| |\nabla\phi| G_\lambda + |\phi|^2 |\nabla G_\lambda| \right) dx \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega,n,q)} \|a\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \left(\varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx + \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{|L-t+\lambda|} \right) \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the case when $n = 1$, it stands that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega |a\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \\
&\leq \|a^2\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \|\phi^2 G_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)} \|a\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla(\phi^2 G_\lambda)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Sobolev inequality)} \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)} \|a\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \left(|\phi| |\nabla\phi| G_\lambda + |\phi|^2 |\nabla G_\lambda| \right) dx \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)} \|a\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \left(\textstyle\int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\textstyle\int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)} \\
&\quad + C_{(\Omega)} \|a\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \left(\tfrac{1}{|L-t+\lambda|} \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right) \\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)} \|a\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \left(\varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx + \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{|L-t+\lambda|} \right) \int_\Omega |\phi|^2 G_\lambda dx \right) \ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega a\left|\phi\right|^2 G_\lambda dx\\
&\leq \left\|a\right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\left\|\phi^2 G_\lambda\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)}\\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)}\left\|a\right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\left\|\nabla\left(\phi^2 G_\lambda\right)\right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Sobolev inequality)}\\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)}\left\|a\right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\int_\Omega\left(\left|\phi\right|\left|\nabla\phi\right|G_\lambda+\left|\phi\right|^2\left|\nabla G_\lambda\right|\right)dx \quad \text{(by Hölder inequality)}\\
&\leq C_{(\Omega)}\left\|a\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\left(\varepsilon\int_\Omega\left|\nabla\phi\right|^2 G_\lambda dx+\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}+\frac{1}{\left|L-t+\lambda\right|}\right)\int_\Omega\left|\phi\right|^2 G_\lambda dx\right)\ \forall\varepsilon>0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgments. This work was partially supported by the National Basis Research Program of China (973 Program) under grant 2011CB808002 and the National Science Foundation of China under grant 11161130003.

References

[BT] Bardos, C., Tartar, L.: Sur l'unicité retrograde des équations paraboliques et quelques questions voisines, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **50**, 10–25 (1973)

[DFGZ] Doubova, A., Fernandez-Cara, E., Gonzalez-Burgos, M., Zuazua, E.: On the controllability of parabolic systems with a nonlinear term involving the state and the gradient, SIAM J. Control Optim. **41**, 798–819 (2002)

[DZZ] Duyckaerts, T., Zhang, X., Zuazua, E.: On the optimality of the observability inequalities for parabolic and hyperbolic systems with potentials, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis **25**, 1–41 (2008)

[EFV] Escauriaza, L., Fernandez, F.J., Vessella, S.: Doubling properties of caloric functions, Applicable analysis **85** (1-2), 205–223 (2006)

[F] Fattorini, H.: Infinite Dimensional Linear Control Systems; the Time Optimal and Norm Optimal Problems, North-Holland Mathematical Studies vol 201, Elsevier, Amsterdam (2005)

[FI] Fursikov, A.V., Imanuvilov, O.Y.: Controllability of Evolution Equations. Lecture Notes Series, 34. Seoul National University, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul (1996)

[K] Kenig, C.: Quantitative unique continuation, logarithmic convexity of gaussian means and Hardy's uncertainty principle, Proc. of Symp. of Pure Math., Volume in celebration of V. Mazya's 70 birthday, 79, 207–227 (2008)

[KT] Koch, H., Tataru, D.: Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second order parabolic equations with non smooth coefficients, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **34**, 305–366 (2009)

[LR] Lebeau, G., Robbiano, L.: Contrôle exact de l' équation de la chaleur, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **20**, 335–356 (1995)

[L] Lin, F.H.: Remarks on a backward parabolic problem, Methods and Applications of Analysis **10** (2), 245-252 (2003)

[M] Miller, L.: A direct Lebeau-Robbiano strategy for the observability of heat-like semigroups, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Series B **14** (4), 1465–1485 (2010)

[MS] Mizel, V., Seidman, T.: An abstract 'bang-bang principle' and time optimal boundary control of the heat equation, SIAM J. Control Optim. **35**, 1204–1216 (1997)

[PW] Phung, K.D., Wang, G.: Quantitative unique continuation for the semilinear heat equation in a convex domain, Journal of Functional Analysis **259** (5), 1230–1247 (2010)

[P] Poon, C.C.: Unique continuation for parabolic equations , Comm. Partial Differential Equations **21**, 521–539 (1996)

[W] Wang, G.: L^∞-null controllability for the heat equation and its consequences for the time optimal control problem, SIAM J. Control Optim. **47**, 1701–1720 (2008)